### REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of the present application. The Examiner is requested to confirm consideration of the IDS submitted January 16, 2001.

The patentability of the claims is discussed in greater detail below. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### I. The Claimed Invention

Independent Claim 1, for example, is directed to a secure wireless local area network (LAN) device including a housing, a wireless transceiver carried by the housing, and a media access controller (MAC) carried by the housing. The device also includes a cryptography circuit carried by the housing and connected to the MAC and the wireless transceiver. The cryptography circuit operates using cryptography information and renders unusable the cryptography information based upon tampering.

Independent Claim 13 is similar to Claim 1 and recites a connector carried by the housing for connecting to a LAN station and a LAN access point instead of the MAC.

Independent Claim 24 is also similar to Claim 1 and recites that the cryptography circuit includes a volatile memory for storing the cryptography information, and a battery for maintaining the cryptography information in the volatile memory.

Independent Claim 30 is similar to Claim 13 and recites that the cryptography circuit includes a volatile

memory for storing the cryptography information, and a battery for maintaining the cryptography information in the volatile memory. Independent Claim 36 is directed to a secure wireless local area network (LAN) system including a plurality of LAN devices each including the cryptography circuit. Independent Claim 46 is directed to a method of storing cryptography information in the cryptography circuit.

# II. The Claimed Invention is Patentable

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 13, 24, 30, 36, and 46 as unpatentable over the Treadaway et al. '477 patent in view of the Schneck et al. application, and the Bambridge et al. patent. The Treadaway et al. '477 patent discloses a secure wireless LAN including a transceiver, a MAC, and a cryptography circuit. The Examiner correctly recognized that the Treadaway et al. '477 patent fails to disclose a cryptography circuit that renders unusable the cryptography information based upon tampering, but cites the Schneck et al. application as providing such. The Schneck et al. application discloses a "coprocessor protected by a tamper detection mechanism that causes the rules, cryptographic data, and decrypted protected data to be destroyed" as described at paragraph [0067].

The Treadaway et al. '477 patent disclose a secure wireless LAN in which the Ethernet data packets to be transmitted over the link 102 are encrypted by the encryption/decryption block 264 as described at column 23, lines 47-56. For example, data received by antenna 508 (FIG. 15) leaves the outdoor unit (ODU) 104 as unencrypted data

along cable 556, and, alternatively, data sent by antenna 508 enters the outdoor unit (ODU) 104 as unencrypted data along cable 556. Consequently, there is no motivation to add the tamper detection mechanism of the Schneck et al. application to the ODU 104 in the Treadaway et al. '477 patent because the unencrypted data in the cable 556 would provide an easy way to circumvent such a tamper detection mechanism. Therefore, not only does the Treadaway et al. '477 patent never consider a tamper detection mechanism to protect data, but the Treadaway et al. '477 patent teaches that easily accessible unencrypted code is transmitted over cable 556 thereby rendering tamper detection superfluous.

In addition, the Schneck et al. application fails to disclose that its tamper detection mechanism should be combined with a MAC and wireless transceiver. Instead, the Schneck et al. application teaches that a coprocessor is protected by the tamper detection mechanism as described in paragraph [0067], but fails to consider connecting the tamper detection mechanism to a MAC and a wireless transceiver.

Further, the Examiner cites Bambridge et al. patent as disclosing a MAC board mounted within a housing. (Column 5, lines 26-45). As the Bambridge et al. patent fails to provide a cryptography circuit for rendering unusable cryptography information based upon tampering, the Bambridge et al. patent adds nothing to the deficiencies of the Treadaway et al. '477 patent and the Schneck et al. application.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight, gleaned from the Applicants' own specification, as motivation to selectively

combine disjoint pieces of the prior art in an attempt to produce the claimed invention. There is simply no proper motivation in the prior art to selectively combine bits and pieces from the three cited prior art references.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 13, 24, 30, 36, and 46 are patentable. Their respective dependent claims, which recite yet further distinguishing features, are also patentable over the prior art and require no further discussion herein.

### CONCLUSIONS

In view of the arguments presented above, it is submitted that all of the claims are patentable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested in due course. Should any minor informalities need to be addressed, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DOUGLAS J. VISNIUS

Reg. No. 48,012

Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath

& Gilchrist, P.A.

255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401

Post Office Box 3791

Orlando, Florida 32802

407-841-2330

407-841-2343 fax

Agent for Applicants

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing correspondence has been forwarded via facsimile number 571-273-8300 to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 this day of November, 2005.